



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

a Theodorean but also that he took much of his material directly from Theodorus. This is the part of the work that is most open to criticism. Because of his eagerness to find support for this, his main thesis, Mutschmann occasionally goes astray in his interpretation and sometimes forms conclusions from insufficient evidence. Earlier in the work he emphasizes the fact that undoubtedly we have lost a large mass of rhetorical writings and utters a protest against the tendency in source criticism to attribute everything to the few authors of whom we have some knowledge. He should have applied this same principle with greater rigor to his own discussion of the relation of Pseudo-Longinus to Theodorus, where he sometimes errs in regarding what seems to have been common stock of the rhetoricians of that period as the peculiar property of Theodorus.

The book is of value as a supplement to the work of Otto and H. F. Müller in combating the modern tendency to find in Caecilius the chief, if not the only, source of this treatise. It also contains some points of interest in matters of interpretation, especially in the treatment of the author's motivation of digressions. It leaves something to be desired in the way of a thorough and impartial discussion of the sources of this work.

R. H. TUKEY

WILLIAM JEWELL COLLEGE

---

*Die lateinische Übersetzung der Didache kritisch und sprachlich untersucht. . . .* Von LEO WOHLER. Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums, siebenter Band, 1. Heft. Paderborn: Ferd. Schöningh, 1913. M. 6.

This is an admirable study, by a pupil of Schmalz and Heer, of an interesting bit of Latin Christian translation. In 1721, the Benedictine scholar Petz published a fragment of a *Doctrina Apostolorum*—"Viae duae sunt in saeculo, vitae et mortis, lucis et tenebrarum"—from a Melk MS (saec. IX-X). It lay unnoted till after Bryennios' discovery in 1883 of the Greek text of the *Διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων*; in 1900, it was supplemented by Schlecht's find—the complete Latin version, in a Freising MS. Wohler here gives us a critical commentary on the text; a very interesting discussion of the vocabulary and style of the work; a new edition, with a Greek original opposite, reconstructed when necessary; an appendix treating the verb *alto* and its compounds; and complete Latin-Greek and Greek-Latin concordances.

There is only internal evidence to date the *Doctrina*; but its Latin is surprisingly good. Ἐν αἰσχύνῃ becomes "*cum pudore*"; πρὸς τὸ δοῦναι, "*ad reddendum*"; ἦλθεν . . . καλέσαι, "*uenit ut . . . inuitaret*"; κυριότης, "*dominica*" (nom. pl. neut.); ὑψηλοί, "*altiores*"; late translators would have been servile. The only bad slip is *suo* for *eius*. Interesting points are: the Egyptian order of the prohibitions in the Decalogue (adultery

before murder); the use of *adolator* (=ἰποκρίτης); *affectatio* (=ἰπόκρισις); *animosus* (=iratus); *de* for *ex* (=ἐκ); *decipere de spe*; *loquela*; *moechatio*; *murmuriosus*; *peremptor* (=intersector); *remunerator* (=a lavish briber); *tendiculum* (=παγίς); *uana superstitio* (=εἰδωλολατρία); and *zelus*. Wohleb concludes that the translation is probably of the third century, and not African, but perhaps North Italian. Among stimulating discussions are those on ways of translating Greek participial constructions, and the use of *ille*, *is*, and *ipse* in rendering αὐτός. Wohleb does not seem to me to prove his case in *decipere* = *se decipere* (p. 37). Misprints are very few.

It is a curious fact, not noted by Wohleb, that the clausulae of the first three chapters and the doxology are prevailingly (56 against 10) of the regular accentual type common from the fourth century on. Chaps. iv and v show a large majority of the irregular forms.

C. U. CLARK

NEW HAVEN, CONN.

---

*Andocidis orationes*. Edidit FRIDERICUS BLASS. Editio quarta correctior, curavit C. FUHR. Leipzig: Teubner, 1913. Pp. xxii+124. M. 1.80.

This is a thorough revision of the third edition (1906) of Blass's Teubner text of Andocides. Fuhr reprints Blass's long preface, which contains an account of the MSS, a bibliography, and a discussion of the forms of words; he adds in brackets occasional statements of his own, and brings the bibliography down to date.

All our MSS of Speeches I and II of Andocides are derived from one, Crippsianus (A). For Speeches II and III we have also Ambrosianus (Q), a MS somewhat inferior to A. The simplicity of the critical apparatus and the comparatively few apparent corruptions in the manuscript tradition make the task of the editor less difficult than in the case of most of the orators, yet a considerable body of corrections and conjectures have been accumulating from the editions of Stephanus and Reiske on. The work of the editor is largely with these. Blass embodied many in the critical notes of his third edition. Fuhr has now enlarged these citations of corrections and conjectures, added some of his own, greatly enlarged the number of references to other Greek writers, and in many cases given more precise account of the indications of the MS where the reading is obscure.

In the text Fuhr has in a considerable number of cases restored the MS reading as against a conjecture adopted by Blass; he has seldom adopted a conjecture that Blass rejected. His text is therefore closer to the MS tradition. In Speeches III and IV Fuhr gives somewhat less weight to Q as against A; in some fifteen instances he follows A where Blass took the reading of Q (iii. 7, 11, 12, 13, 18, 33, 34, 39; iv. 2, 8, 8, 13, 14, 22, 34). In a few cases he corrects errors or oversights in Blass's text; so the accent of τή,